

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58 and cancelled claims 12, 24, 28, 32, 39, 42, 44, 49, 54, 57 & 59. The amended claims incorporate subject matter of the cancelled claims. Additional support for the claim changes may be found in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 11 to 25; page 13, lines 10 to 16, page 14, lines 21 to 32; and FIGs. 4 & 11.

Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55, 56, 58 & 60-65 are now pending in the subjection application.

Claim Rejections

Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 5,774,729 to *Carney et al.* ("*Carney*") cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) because the patent does not teach or suggest all the features recited in the claim.

Carney discloses a method for handling events in a computer system that occur during the execution of programs having routines prepared in a plurality of computer programming languages. (*Carney*, Col. 1:59-63.) A event handler is initialized for each computer programming language. (*Id.* at Col. 1:65-67.) Events of interest to the event handlers are detected and parameters associated with the selected event are determined. (*Id.* at Cols. 1:66-2:2.)

Events may be divided into two types: broadcast or targeted, wherein broadcast events are sent to all event handlers and targeted events are sent to a single event handler. (*Id.* at Col. 2:3-7.) An event code is passed to the event handlers so that each can perform an appropriate for that event in the context of the programming language being supported. (*Id.* at Col. 2:7-11.)

More specifically, *Carney* provides an event handling unit 11 that interfaces an application program 12 with event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:1-5; FIG. 1.) When a relevant event is detected by an event detector, an event handler interface unit 24 in event handling unit 11 gathers the needed parameters and passes them along with an event code which identifies the type of event to one or more event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:27-31; FIG. 2.) When a defined event occurs, the event handler unit 11 makes a number of determinations to route the event to the correct event handlers 13-15. (*Id.* at Col. 4:41-60.) The type of the event determines whether the event should be broadcast to event handlers 13-15 or targeted to a single event handler. (*Id.*)

The Examiner apparently asserts that *Carney's* "types" correspond to the claimed "routing types." However in *Carney*, event handling unit (EHU) 11 determines the types *based on parameters it gathers*. (*Id.* at Col. 7:40-54; Table I; Col. 4:27-31.) For instance, event handling unit (EHU) 11 can examine information (e.g., a member number) in the program prologue area (PPA) of the routine in which the event occurred. (*Id.* at Col. 7:47-54.)

EHU 11 does not determine a "type" based on "an event specifying an assigned routing type," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, *Carney* says nothing with regard to "receiving an event *specifying an assigned routing type*" and "determining a routing mechanism for the received event *based on the specified routing type*," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

In the Advisory Action dated December 5, 2008, the Examiner argues "the claims, as discussed on the Final Office Action, are met by the prior art. (Advisory Action, p. 2.) Applicant notes, however, that neither the Final Office Action nor the Advisory Action, address the above-identified features of claim 1. Because *Carney* does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 1, the patent cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under Sections 102 or 103. Claim 1 is, therefore, allowable over *Carney*."

Independent claims 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58, although of different scope than claim 1, recite features similar to the above-noted features of claim 1. Accordingly, *Carney* cannot support a rejection of claim 1 for at least the same reasons given above. Claims 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58 are, therefore, allowable over *Carney*, as well.

Dependent claims 2-11, 14-23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 47, 48, 51-53, 56 & 60-65 are also allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 1, 13, 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 45, 50, 55 & 58.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the applied reference.

If additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 15, 2008

By: /Steven Ashburn/
Steven L. Ashburn
Registration No. 56,636

Customer No. 21839